

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES

FILED

08 AUG 18 AM 11:43

This space for
Clerk's Office File Stamp
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Sabraw *MS*

TO: ☒ U. S. DISTRICT JUDGE / ☐ U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE
FROM: J. Paris, Deputy Clerk RECEIVED DATE: 7/3/08 DEPUTY
CASE NO.: 07cv2388 DOCUMENT FILED BY: Mr. Fox
CASE TITLE: Fox v. USA, et al.
DOCUMENT ENTITLED: Motion appointing counsel

Upon the submission of the attached document(s), the following discrepancies are noted:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local Rule	Discrepancy
<input type="checkbox"/> 5.1	Missing time and date on motion and/or supporting documentation
<input type="checkbox"/> 5.3	Document illegible or submitted on thermal facsimile paper
<input type="checkbox"/> 5.4	Document not filed electronically. Notice of Noncompliance already issued.
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1 or 47.1	Date noticed for hearing not in compliance with rules/Document(s) are not timely
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1 or 47.1	Lacking memorandum of points and authorities in support as a separate document
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1 or 47.1	Briefs or memoranda exceed length restrictions
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1	Missing table of contents
<input type="checkbox"/> 15.1	Amended pleading not complete in itself
<input type="checkbox"/> 30.1	Depositions not accepted absent a court order
<input type="checkbox"/>	Supplemental documents require court order
<input type="checkbox"/>	Default Judgment in sum certain includes calculated interest
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X	<u>OTHER: Case Closed</u>

Date forwarded: 7/3/08

ORDER OF THE JUDGE / MAGISTRATE JUDGE

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

- ☐ The document is to be filed nunc pro tunc to date received.
- ☒ The document is NOT to be filed, but instead REJECTED, and it is ORDERED that the Clerk serve a copy of this order on all parties.
- Rejected document to be returned to pro se or inmate? ☒ Yes. *MS* Court Copy retained by chambers ☐

Counsel is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursuant to Local Rule 83.1

CHAMBERS OF: Judge Sabraw

Dated: 8/18/08
cc: All Parties

By: mm

REJECTED

UNITED STATES FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MICHAEL FOX

PLAINTIFF

CASE NUMBER 07 CV 2388 DMS (POV)

VERSES

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA et.al.

DEFENDANTS

MOTION TO WHERE PLAINTIFF
IS SEEKING COURT APPOINTED
ATTORNEY

MOTION DATE OF AUG 15 2008 1:30PM
JUDGE DANA M SABRAW COURTROOM 10

-
- 1) PLAINTIFF FILING PETITION AND COMPLAINT WITH EXHIBITS 1 THRU 20 ON DEC 20 2007
 - 2) PLAINTIFF ASKING FOR A COURT APPOINTED ATTORNEY WHEN FILING IN COURT CLERKS OFFICE FOR A COURT APPOINTED ATTORNEY ON DEC 20 2007
 - 3) PLAINTIFF NEVER HEARING A THING ABOUT HIS REQUEST FOR COURT APPOINTED ATTORNEY--STATED IN PLAINTIFFS OPPOSITION OF DEFENDANTS MOTION TO DISMISS ON APRIL 11 2008.. THAT PLAINTIFF HAD ASKED FOR A COURT APPOINTED ATTORNEY, AND THAT PLAINTIFF HAD NOT BEEN APPOINTED COUNSEL AS REQUESTED..
 - 4) ON APRIL 17 2008--US MAGISTATE JUDGE LOUISA S PORTER DENIED PLAINTIFFS REQUEST FOR A COURT APPOINTED ATTORNEY..
 - 5) THAT ON JUNE 20 2008 THE COURT ENTERED ITS MOTION IN REGARDS TO PLAINTIFFS DEFAULT JUDGEMENTS PLAINTIFF IS SEEKING..
 - 6) PLAINTIFF BEING DENIED DEFAULT JUDGEMENTS AS TO A 1ST AMENDED COMPLAINT THAT SUPERCEDES THE ORIGINAL COMPLAINT..
 - 7) THAT PLAINTIFF IS NOT KNOWLEDGABLE OF THE LAW AND FILING PROCEDURE AS TO A 1ST AMENDED COMPLAINT WHICH WIPES OUT THE ORIGINAL PETITION AND COMPLAINT. THAT THIS MISTAKE PLAINTIFF HAS MADE IS HUGE. THAT THE PLAINTIFF IS FURTHER INTITLED TO